

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/711,697	09/30/2004	Ronald G. Filippi	FIS920040188US1	5696	
45094 75	03/09/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC			AU, BAC H		
75 STATE ST 14TH FL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALBANY, NY	12207		2822		
			DATE MAILED: 03/09/2000	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,697	FILIPPI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Bac H. Au	2822	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	; ==
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of 15 NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by so Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tatute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communi ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	30 September 2004.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the meri	its is
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2004	$\underline{4}$ is/are: a) \boxtimes accepted or b)	objected to by the Examiner.	•
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received in	Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		n received in this National Stage	8
application from the International Bu	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	i list of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)	🗖	O	•
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date 30 September 2004.	"	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2822

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-5, 11-13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Su (U.S. Pub. 2006/0019482) in view of Clarke (U.S. Pub. 2005/0230836).

Regarding claims 1, 11, and 17, Su [Figs.2-8] discloses a method of forming a gas dielectric structure for a semiconductor structure, the method comprising the steps of:

forming an opening [Fig.3] for semiconductor structure in a dielectric layer [30] on a substrate [10];

depositing a sacrificial layer [50] over the opening;

performing a directional etch on the sacrificial layer to form a sacrificial layer sidewall on the opening [Fig.5; para.26 1-5];

depositing a metal [80] in the opening;

planarizing the metal and the conductive liner [Para.27 lines 1-5];

removing the sacrificial layer sidewall [Para.28 lines 1-4] to form a void [90]; and depositing a cap layer [100] over the void to form the gas dielectric structure;

performing a dual damascene process to form an opening including at least one wiring opening and at least one via in a dielectric layer on a substrate [Para.33; Su discloses the invention being applicable to damascene processes, including dual damascene. It is inherent in a dual damascene process that wiring opening (trenches) and via are formed.];

performing a via-first dual damascene process to form an opening including at least one wiring opening and at least one via in a dielectric layer on a substrate [Para.33; Su discloses the invention being applicable to damascene processes. It is inherent that this includes a via-first dual damascene process. It is inherent in a dual damascene process that wiring opening (trench) and via are formed];

removing the sacrificial layer sidewall [Para.28 lines 1-4] to form a void [90] that extends along a side of the at least one via.

Su fails to disclose in the method the step of depositing a conductive liner over the opening. However, Clarke discloses the step of depositing a conductive liner over the opening prior to depositing the metal layer [Para.28 lines 13-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Clarke into the method of Su to include the step of depositing a conductive liner over the opening. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Su in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of having

Art Unit: 2822

a seed layer to facilitate the subsequent deposition of the metal layer [Clarke; Para.28 lines 13-15].

Regarding claims 2-4 and 12, Clarke [Figs.3-4G] discloses the method wherein the opening includes at least one wiring line opening [490] and at least one via [495];

wherein the void [450] extends along a side of the at least one via; wherein the forming step includes performing a dual damascene process [Para.15 lines 7-10].

Regarding claims 5 and 13, Su [Figs.4-5] discloses wherein the forming step includes depositing a hard mask [60], patterning the hard mask and etching the hard mask.

2. Claims 7-8, 15-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Su and Clarke as applied to claims 1, 11, and 17 above, and further in view of Cowley (U.S. Pub. 2004/0058526).

Regarding claims 7-8, 15-16, and 19-20, Su and Clarke failed to disclose in the method wherein the conductive liner includes at least one of the group consisting of: tantalum (Ta), tantalum nitride (TaN), titanium (Ti), titanium nitride (TiN), tungsten (W) and niobium (Nb); and wherein the sacrificial layer includes one of the group consisting of: aluminum (Al), silicon dioxide (SiO₂) and titanium (Ti).

Art Unit: 2822

However, Cowley [Figs.2-9] discloses the method

wherein the conductive liner [28] includes at least one of the group consisting of: tantalum (Ta), tantalum nitride (TaN), titanium (Ti), titanium nitride (TiN), tungsten (W) and niobium (Nb) [Para.25 lines 2-5]; and

wherein the sacrificial layer [34] includes one of the group consisting of: aluminum (AI), silicon dioxide (SiO₂) and titanium (Ti) [Para.27 lines 1-7].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Cowley into the method of Su and Clarke to include in the method wherein the conductive liner includes at least one of the group consisting of: tantalum (Ta), tantalum nitride (TaN), titanium (Ti), titanium nitride (TiN), tungsten (W) and niobium (Nb); and wherein the sacrificial layer includes one of the group consisting of: aluminum (Al), silicon dioxide (SiO₂) and titanium (Ti). The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Su and Clarke in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of having an effective diffusion barrier layer [Cowley; para.25 lines 3-5]. Additionally, the sacrificial layer functions as a gettering layer to remove undesirable compounds from the interlevel dielectric [Cowley; para.27 lines 12-16].

3. Claims 6, 14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Su and Clarke as applied to claims 1, 11, and 17 above, and further in view of Tsai (U.S. Pub. 2003/0077897).

Art Unit: 2822

Regarding claims 6, 14, and 18, Su and Clarke disclose the step of depositing the sacrificial layer, but fail to disclose in the method further comprising the step of depositing a non-conductive liner prior to the step of depositing the sacrificial layer, wherein the non-conductive liner includes one of the group consisting of: silicon nitride (Si₃N₄) and silicon dioxide (SiO₂). However, Tsai [Fig.2c] discloses the method comprising the step of depositing a non-conductive liner [250] prior to the step of depositing the sacrificial layer, wherein the non-conductive liner includes one of the group consisting of: silicon nitride (Si₃N₄) and silicon dioxide (SiO₂).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Tsai into the method of Su and Clarke to include in the method further comprising the step of depositing a non-conductive liner prior to the step of depositing the sacrificial layer, wherein the non-conductive liner includes one of the group consisting of: silicon nitride (Si₃N₄) and silicon dioxide (SiO₂). The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Su and Clarke in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of forming a protective layer to prevent via poisoning in subsequent processing steps [Tsai; para.17].

4. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Su and Clarke as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Te Velde (U.S. Pat. 4561173).

Regarding claims 9-10, Su and Clarke disclose the step of removing the sacrificial sidewall layer by etching, but fail to disclose in the method wherein the

Art Unit: 2822

removing step includes etching the sacrificial sidewall layer using one of: a) water (H₂O) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH); b) water (H₂O) and hydrofluoric acid (HF); and c) hydrofluoric acid (HF) and hydrochloric acid (HCI); and wherein in the case that water (H₂O) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH) are used as an etchant, the ratio of H₂O to NaOH is no greater than approximately 10:1 and no less than 1:1.

However, Te Velde [Col.6 lines 51-55] discloses the method wherein the removing step includes etching the sacrificial sidewall layer using one of: a) water (H₂O) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH); b) water (H₂O) and hydrofluoric acid (HF); and c) hydrofluoric acid (HF) and hydrochloric acid (HCl); and wherein in the case that water (H₂O) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH) are used as an etchant, the ratio of H₂O to NaOH is no greater than approximately 10:1 and no less than 1:1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Te Velde into the method of Su and Clarke to include in the method wherein the removing step includes etching the sacrificial sidewall layer using one of: a) water (H₂O) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH); b) water (H₂O) and hydrofluoric acid (HF); and c) hydrofluoric acid (HF) and hydrochloric acid (HCl); and wherein in the case that water (H₂O) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH) are used as an etchant, the ratio of H₂O to NaOH is no greater than approximately 10:1 and no less than 1:1. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Su and Clarke in the manner set forth above for at least the purpose of having an effective etchant with desired selectivity.

Art Unit: 2822

Conclusion

Page 8

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bac H. Au whose telephone number is 571-272-8795. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on 571-272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BHA

Supervisory Patent Examiner